

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE UNDCS FOR TURKEY (2011 – 2015)**

***1. BACKGROUND***

In December 2010, the United Nations (UN) system in Turkey signed a third generation Common Country Programme Document in cooperation with the Government of Turkey. This document, known as United Nations Development Cooperation Strategy (UNDCS), set forth three strategic areas of cooperation between the UN system and the Turkish Government in the five-year programme period, from 2011 to 2015.

The UNDCS is designed to serve as a pilot in developing a Middle Income Country (MIC) prototype UN Development Assistance Framework. It follows the decision to adapt the programming cycle to the requirements of the General Assembly Resolution 63/223, which recognizes that MICs still face significant development challenges and require international support aligned with national development priorities. Simultaneously, the Resolution underlines the significant contributions of MICs to global and regional development and economic stability, as well as the solidarity of middle-income countries with other developing countries.

The UNDCS was formulated under the full leadership of the Government of Turkey, and came as a result of a consultative process that involved the UN system and its major stakeholders. It emphasized the importance of national ownership and established a partnership model designed to support Turkey, on one hand, in achieving its internationally agreed development goals, and on the other, laid the ground for a collaboration action in the field of development cooperation towards developing countries.

The Ministry of Development (formerly the State Planning Organization) had a leadership role in driving the UNDCS process. The Directorate General for Social Sectors and Coordination of the State Planning Organization (SPO) was selected as the responsible department to cooperate with the UN system in the implementation and the monitoring of the UNDCS.

The rationale of this evaluation is to improve accountability for results and provide learning in terms of what has worked, what has not and why. The UN system in Turkey in close partnership with the Government of Turkey is currently in the process of finalizing the next UNDCS, covering the years 2016-2020. Consequently, *this evaluation seeks to inform the implementation stages of the next strategy.*

The primary users of the evaluation are the UN Country Team (UNCT), including non-resident agencies, key government counterparts, civil society and respective executive boards, in addition to bilateral and multilateral donors.

1. ***UNDCS EVALUATION CONTEXT***

The UNDCS came to life during the Ninth National Development Plan (NDP) of the Republic of Turkey, covering the years 2007-2013. The UNDCS is in line with the NDP vision of Turkey as “a country of information society, growing in stability, sharing more equitably, globally competitive and fully completed her integration with the European Union”. This vision includes the accession to the European Union (EU), the achievements and shortcomings of Turkey in fulfilling the MDGs as a MIC, the human development indices, and what the UN system can do to support. Five strategic objectives of the Ninth NDP have formed the basis of the UNDCS.

The three strategic areas and the seven results of the UNDCS are:

**Democratic and Environmental Governance**

***Result 1****: Enabled environment for inclusive and democratic governance, the rule of law and access to justice for all including further compliance with international commitments and human rights norms and standards.*

***Result 2****: Empowered individuals and vulnerable groups participate equally in and influence decision-making processes at all levels.*

***Result 3****: Strengthened policy formulation and implementation capacity for the protection of the environment and cultural heritage in line with sustainable development principles, taking into consideration climate change, including disaster management, with a special focus on gender perspective.*

**Disparity Reduction, Social Inclusion and Basic Public Services**

***Result 4****: Increased provision of inclusive and responsive public as well as community-based services to strengthen equitable access to knowledge, information and quality basic services (education, health, nutrition, water and sanitation, and human safety)*

***Result 5****: Equal participation of women ensured in all fields of public sector, private sector and civil society with strengthened institutional mechanisms to empower women’s status.*

**Poverty and Employment**

***Result 6****: Enhanced poverty alleviation through the implementation of more effective income inequality reduction policies and programmes.*

***Result 7****: Increased opportunities for employment and decent work for all through the implementation of equity-enhancing policies, strategies and programmes that promote economic growth, based on competitiveness, increased productivity and corporate social responsibility.*

At the end of 2011, the UNCT in Turkey engaged a team of consultants to assist in establishing an appropriate M&E Mechanism for the UNDCS. The team of consultants assisted the UNCT in identifying areas of engagement under the seven results of the UNDCS. Furthermore, they proposed an M&E framework operating at three levels where assessment occured against a limited number of key questions at each level:

* Level 1: each individual programme, whether a single Agency or joint;
* Level 2: Thematic Groups, covering each ‘area of engagement’ identified for UNDCS Outcomes;
* Level 3: the UNDCS Working Group, across all UNDCS Outcomes.

The initial structure of the UNDCS groups has evolved over the past years and currently includes three Thematic Groups and eight Working Groups.

The three thematic Groups, on respectively Gender, Youth, and Human Rights, act as a ‘hub’ for reviewing progress for its related issue. The Working Groups seek to further ensure and improve coordination among UN organizations, and currently include the following groups: HIV/AIDS, Monitoring for Strategıc Results, Regional Development, Operation Management Team, Communication, Environment, Syria Response, and a Task Force on Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT).

A Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the UNDCS was conducted in 2013 to determine the status of implementation, assess achievements and make recommendations for a more efficient and effective implementation of the remainder of the programme cycle. One annual review was conducted for the year of 2014.

The UNDCS evaluation is a stand-alone exercise, but will seek to capitalize on other reviews conducted during the programme cycle, such as the MTR, the 2014 Annual Review, and other relevant agency evaluations and reviews.

1. ***PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES and SCOPE***

The overall **purposes** of the evaluation are to gather key findings and lessons learned to inform the implementation stages of the next programme cycle, and to support greater accountability towards agreed national objectives and priorities in Turkey.

The **objectives** of the evaluation are:

* to assess the contribution made by the UN System in the framework of the UNDCS to national development results through making judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence;
* to identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution, answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks, and based on that extrapolate lessons learned;
* to provide actionable recommendations for improving the UNCT's contribution and coordination and monitoring mechanisms, especially for incorporation into the new cycle. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation.

The **scope** covered by the evaluation includes examining the outcomes/outputs included in the UNDCS Results Framework. The time period covered by the evaluation is 2011 to mid-2015.

1. ***EVALUATION QUESTIONS and METHODOLOGY***

Given that outcomes are the work of a number of partners, and UNDCS outcomes are set at a very high level, attribution of development change to the UNCT may be extremely difficult and potentially infeasible. The evaluation will therefore consider contribution of the UNCT to the change in the stated UNDCS outcome and the evaluators will need to explain how the UNDCS contributed to the observed results.

The following section introduces some basic evaluation questions addressing the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability). The Evaluation Team will detail out and finalize the evaluation questions and evaluation matrix in the inception period.

**4.1 Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions**

**Assessing relevance** of the UNDCS in relation to the issues it was designed to address as well as their underlying causes:

* To what extent have the UNDCS outcomes addressed key development issues and national priorities in Turkey, their underlying cause and challenges, and what are the gaps that should (have) receive(d) further attention?
* To what extent have the agency-specific Country Programmes been result-oriented, relevant, and mutually reinforcing the UNDCS outcomes?
* To what extent has the UNDCS been relevant in terms of Turkey’s international and regional commitments, including human rights instruments and the recommendation of Human Rights mechanisms (treaty bodies, special procedure and UPR), sustainable development and the needs of women and men, girls and boys in Turkey?
* To what extent was the UNDCS Results Matrix flexible and relevant to respond to new issues and their causes as well as challenges that arose during the UNDCS cycle, including the humanitarian situation?

**Assessing effectiveness**, to theextent possible, of the UNCT’s contribution to the outcomes defined in the UNDCS:

* What progress has been made towards the realization of the UNDCS outcomes in terms of the stated indicators in the UNDCS framework?
* What were the main factors that promoted or hindered the effectiveness of the UNDCS?
* Have there been any unintended results, and if so, have they affected national development positively or negatively, and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed?

**Assessing efficiency** of the UNDCS as a mechanism to minimize transaction costs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.) of UN support for the Government of Turkey and for the UN organizations:

* How well has the UNDCS implementation been managed by the UNCT;
* To what extent and in what way has the UNDCS contributed to a reduction of transaction costs for the government and for each of the UN agencies? In what ways could transaction costs be further reduced?
* To what extent have the organizations harmonized procedures in order to reduce transaction costs and to enhance results?

**Assessing sustainability** of the UNDCS implementation**:**

* To what extent can one say that the benefits from the UNDCS implementation have continued, or are likely to continue, after it is completed?
* Have complementarities, collaboration and/or synergies fostered by UNDCS contributed to greater sustainability of results of Donor intervention in Turkey?

***Enabling / explanatory factors that can be assumed to affect the performance of the UNDCS:***

**Assessing the design and focus of the UNDCS:**

* To what extent is the current UNDCS designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework? Are expected outcomes realistic given the UNDCS timeframe, resources and the planned Country Programmes, projects and programme strategies?

**Assessing UN Coordination:**

* To what extent did the UNDCS create actual synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimize results and avoid duplication?
* Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UN agencieswell defined, facilitated in the achievements of results and have the arrangements largely been respected in the course of implementation?

**Assessing the use of UN’s Five Programming Principles**:

* To what extent have the programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) been considered and mainstreamed in the UNDCS chain of results? More specifically:
  + To what extent did the UNDCS make use of and promote **human rights** and **gender equality standards and principles** (e.g. participation, non-discrimination, accountability, etc.) to achieve its goal?

To what extent did UNDCS strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis to ensure disaggregated data on the basis of race, colour, sex, geographic location, etc., and did those subject to discrimination and disadvantage benefited from priority attention?

Did the UNDCS effectively use the principles of **environmental sustainability** to strengthen its contribution to national development results?

* + Did the UNDCS adequately use **RBM** to ensure a logical chain of results, and to what extent the current monitoring system of the UNDCS is adequate to follow the results achieved and practical to be used in the next cycle?
  + Did the UNDCS adequately invest in, and focus on, national **capacity development**? To what extent and in what ways did UNDCS contribute to capacity development of government, NGOs and civil society institutions?
* Were there any shortcomings due to a failure to take into account the five programming principles during implementation?

**Comparative advantage** of the UN system in Turkey:

* To what extent and in what way have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context specifically in relation to other Development Partners active in Turkey (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the special mandates of UN organizations?)

**4.2 Data Collection Methods**

The UNDCS evaluation will draw on the following data collection methods:

* **Document review** focusing on UNDCS planning documents, the mid-term review, the annual reports and past evaluation reports (including those on projects and small-scale initiatives, and those issued by national counterparts), strategy papers, national plans and policies and related programme and project documents.
* **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders (to be defined) to complement the desk review, including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members, and implementing partners.

To the extent possible, data collection methods and process should consider gender sensitivity and data should to be systematically disaggregated by sex and age and, disaggregated by geographical region, ethnicity, disability, migratory status and other contextually-relevant markers of equity.

**Validation**: All findings should be supported with evidence. Triangulation of data (combining qualitative and quantitative as well as data from a range of stakeholders) will have to be used to increase reliability of findings and conclusions.

1. ***MANAGEMENT and CONDUCT of the EVALUATION***

The UNDCS evaluation will be conducted in close cooperation with the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator, the UNDCS Working Group on Monitoring for Strategic Results (WG MfSR), the UNCT, and national counterparts.

National partners and stakeholders will validate the evaluation results, and the final report will feed into the implementation stages of the next UNDCS.

**5.1. Evaluation Management Structure:** The UNDCS Evaluation Team will work under the supervision of a multi-tiered evaluation management structure.

* Direct supervision will be provided by the Evaluation Task Manager, a role taken by UNICEF, as the Chair of the WG MfSR. The Chair may choose to delegate the direct supervision of the evaluator(s) to UNICEF M&E Specialist. The Evaluation Task Manager will be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation and managing the evaluation budget.
* The Evaluation Task Manager in turn reports to the WG MfSR, composed of the Resident Coordinator’s Office, members of the UN agencies. The key roles of the WG MfSR are to ensure that 1) the evaluation process meets UNEG Norms, Standards and Ethical Guidelines and that 2) the evaluation findings are relevant and recommendations are implementable and that 3) the evaluation findings are disseminated and available for use and learning from the evaluation.
* The decision-making organ for the UNDCS Evaluation is the UNCT and relevant national counterparts.

The UNCT, in consultation with national government counterparts, will also be responsible for providing a written and agreed **management response** to the evaluation within two months of receiving the final evaluation report (pls. see UNDAF management response guidance).

* 1. **Evaluation Team Composition**

The evaluation team should ideally consist of a team leader and one or more team members with the below responsibilities. The evaluation may be carried out by one single evaluator if he/she meets the required qualifications.

* The **evaluation team leader** will lead the entire evaluation process, working closely with all team members. He/she will manage the evaluation process in a timely manner and communicate with the Evaluation Manager on a regular basis and highlight progress made/challenges encountered. The team leader will be responsible for producing the inception report and the draft and final evaluation reports.
* The **team members** will contribute to the evaluation process substantively through data collection and analysis. They will share responsibilities for conducting desk review and interviews and conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data. They will provide substantive inputs to the inception report as well as to the draft and final reports.
  1. **Evaluation Process**

The evaluation will be conducted in three phases:

Phase 1: Preparation

1. Preparing the ToRs: The ToRs will be prepared by the UNDCS Monitoring Working Group, and approved by the UNCT.
2. Collection of reference materials: The UN RC Office in close consultations with UNCT members will compile a list of background materials, documents and reports relevant to the UNDCS evaluation.
3. Identification and selection of an Evaluation Team: The UNCT will jointly identify and select the appropriate consultants for the UNDCS evaluation. The UN RC Office will take the lead, jointly with UNCT, in soliciting CVs of consultants available in the country.
4. Development of evaluation strategy and design: Prior to the main data collection phase, the UNDCS Evaluation Team, facilitated by UNCT, will develop an operational plan (an evaluation plan), which will include a design matrix, data collection and analysis methods, and further identify and collect relevant reference material. This evaluation plan will be shared with the UN RC Office and the UNCT for approval.

Phase 2: Conduct of data collection activities and the preparation of the evaluation reports

1. Desk review of reference material: The Evaluation Team is responsible for reviewing the reference documents, reports and any other data and information provided by the UN RC Office.
2. Main data collection: The evaluation team will conduct data collection activities as guided by the evaluation plan. They will conduct agreed-upon interviews with stakeholders and UN staff. At the end of the data collection activities, a meeting will be organized by the Evaluation Team, led by the team leader, participated by key stakeholder representatives, to present preliminary findings and obtain feedback from the stakeholders.
3. Data analysis and reporting: The evaluation team will conduct further data analysis based on all information collected, and prepare a draft evaluation report for the UNDCS Evaluation within three weeks upon completion of the main data collection and analysis activities. The UNDCS Evaluation Team Leader will submit the report to the UNCT.
4. Review of the draft report and finalization of the report: the draft UNDCS Report will be submitted for factual correction and feedback to key stakeholders. The UNDCS Evaluation Team, in consultation with the UNCT, will prepare an audit trail to indicate how the comments were taken into account, and will finalize the UNDCS evaluation report.

Phase 3: Follow up

The UNCT together with the UN RC Office will conduct follow-up activities, as guided by their respective processes and mandates.

In the context of the UNDCS Evaluation:

1. Dissemination of the evaluation findings and recommendations
2. Implementation of a follow-up plan, in particular focusing on informing the last planning stages of the new UNDCS cycle.

Once the evaluation report is completed and validated by the evaluation Steering Committee, it is made publicly available by posting it in UNDG[[1]](#footnote-1) (through UNDOCO) and UNCT websites.

* 1. **Tentative Timeframe**

The consultancy is expected to take a total of 25-30 working days. The consultancy is expected to start mid-December and end in January with submitting a final report.

1. ***BUDGET***

The cost of the UNDCS evaluation will be shared among all involved parties including UN organizations present in Turkey and the Office of the Resident Coordinator in Turkey, based on the agreement reached within the UNCT.

Payment of fees will be based on the delivery of outputs, as follows  
 - upon satisfactory submission of the draft evaluation report: 70%  
 - upon satisfactory submission of the final evaluation report: 30%

1. ***EXPECTED DELIVERABLES***

The evaluation team, or individual, is expected to produce the following deliverables:

1. An Evaluation Work Plan/Design Matrix, which defines the specific evaluation design, tools and procedures, outlining specific dates for key deliverables;
2. An inception report outlining the evaluation team’s understanding of the issues under review including a review framework and a detailed work plan. It further refines the overall evaluation scope, approach, design and timeframe, provides a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology;
3. Presentation with preliminary findings to be shared in a UNCT meeting;
4. First draft report for circulation and identification of factual corrections from stakeholders;
5. Second draft report for circulation to the external advisory panel for quality assurance;
6. Final review report and presentation.
7. ***STRUCTURE of the UNDCS EVALUATION REPORT[[2]](#footnote-2)***

The report should not exceed 50 pages, and include the following sections:

Executive Summary (max 2 pages)

1. Introduction (Context and national priorities, goals, and methodology, brief description of the results, limitations)
2. Reflection on the main findings by criteria
3. Conclusions
4. Lessons Learned
5. Recommendations identifying issues and opportunities to consider in preparing for the next UNDCS 2016-2020
6. Annexes might include:

* Assessment of the progress by outcomes in relevance to the nationally defined goals.
* Stories worth telling (Most Significant Changes).
* List of used documents and persons met.
* Filled in Design Matrix.

1. ***QUALIFICATIONS of the EVALUATION TEAM***

An individual consultant or a group of consultants (preferably gender balanced) may conduct the evaluation. The evaluator(s) must cover the below requirements:

* Team-leader with documented extensive experience (at least 8 full years) in conducting complex development evaluations (preferably experience in conducting evaluations for the UN system in Turkey)
* If relevant, other evaluator(s) with documented experience (at least 5 full years) in conducting development evaluations (having conducted evaluations for UN system is an asset);
* At least one team member with proven extensive experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis;
* At least one team member with proven experience in planning of complex programmes and exposure to UN strategic planning processes;
* At least one team member with solid knowledge of RBM;
* At least one team member with solid knowledge on HRBA and gender equality;
* Excellent report writing skills in English;
* Good communication skills.

The contracting modality can be either an individual contract or a reimbursable loan agreement (if from an institution or business). The contracting authority will be the United Nations Development Programme Country Office Turkey.

The evaluator(s) is responsible to ensure that the process is in line with the Ethical Guidelines of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). The evaluator(s) should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders. Furthermore, they should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual information. All participants should be informed of the context and purpose of the evaluation, as well as of the confidentiality of the information shared. The evaluator(s) should not have taken any role in the planning, implementation or monitoring of the current UNDCS.

The evaluator(s) is allowed to use documents and information provided only for the tasks related to these terms of reference.

***ANNEX 1: EVALUATION TIMELINE (to be updated)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase I – Preparation** | **Responsible Parties** | | **Timeframe** | |
| **Lead Party** | **Other Parties** | **Begin** | **End** |
| 1. Evaluation Steering Committee (**ESC**) is established. | **UNCT** | **National Counterparts** |  |  |
| 2. Evaluation Task Manager (**ETM**) is designated. | **WG** | **UNCT** |  |  |
| 3. Drafting of TOR: **ETM** and **RCO** are responsible for drafting the TOR, in close consultation with **WG** and **ESC** that will validate the final TOR. | **ETM** | **WG**  **ESC** |  |  |
| 4. Selection of an Evaluation Team: the **WG** will open a bidding process for the recruitment of an Evaluation Team based on the agreed upon TOR for the evaluation. An Evaluation Team will be selected by the WG based on an assessment of the proposals received against selection criteria developed. Interviews may also be conducted with candidates. | **WG** | **ETM** |  |  |
| 5. Contracting of Evaluation Team: the **ETM** and **RCO** prepares a contract with the Evaluation Team based on their agreement to conduct the evaluation according to the specifics outlined in the TOR. The contract outlines the responsibilities of the Evaluation Team, duration, fees, travel, etc. | **ETM** | **WG** |  |  |
| **PHASE II - Conduction of the Study** | **Responsible Parties** | | **Time frame** | |
| **Lead party** | **Other** | **Begin** | **End** |
| 1. Briefing of the Evaluation Team: the **ETM** provides access to all relevant documentation (including UNEG Norms and Standards, UNEG Code of Conduct for external Evaluations, programme documents, reviews list of key stakeholders, etc.) to the **Evaluation Team**. All relevant stakeholders, including the **WG** facilitate access to all necessary information. | **ETM** | **WG** |  |  |
| 2. Development of evaluation work plan: in consultation with the **WG** the evaluation team prepares a detailed work plan outlining specific dates for key deliverables | **Evaluation Team** | **ETM**  **WG** |  |  |
| 3. Inception Report:to clarify in writing and through presentations the understanding and expectations of how the evaluation will be undertaken, the **Evaluation Team** will prepare and submit to the **EMG** an Inception Report that further refines the overall evaluation scope, approach, design and timeframe, provides a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology. | **Evaluation Team** | **ETM**  **WG** |  |  |
| 4.Data Collection**:** the **Evaluation Team** collects data deploying various data collection methods agreed upon in the Inception Report such as observation, interviews, focus groups and surveys. Relevant stakeholders from UNCT and the different UN agencies will facilitate access to information and provide all necessary logistical/organisational support. | **Evaluation**  **Team** | **ETM**  **WG** |  |  |
| 5. Preliminary findings: the **Evaluation Team** delivers a presentation on the evaluation preliminary findings to the **ESC** and the **WG** | **Evaluation Team** | **ETM**  **WG**  **ESC** |  |  |
| 6. Reporting: **Evaluation Team** prepares the report in accordance with the UNEG Norms and Standards. The report has to be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations. | **Evaluation Team** | **ETM** |  |  |
| 7. **Evaluation Team** delivers a presentation for the **ESC** and **WG**. | **Evaluation Team** | **ETM**  **WG**  **ESC** |  |  |
| 8. **WG** and **ESC** provide final feedback to the Evaluation Team. | **WG**  **ESC** | **ETM Evaluation Team** |  |  |
| 9. **Evaluation Team** produces a final report based on the **ESC** and **WG** final feedback. | **Evaluation Team** | **ETM**  **ESC**  **WG** |  |  |
| **Phase III – Follow-up** | **Responsible Parties** | | **Timeframe** | |
| **Lead party** | **Other** | **Begin** | **End** |
| 1. Dissemination of Evaluation Findings: in coordination with **WG**, the **ETM** coordinates the dissemination of evaluation findings through the release of the evaluation report. The report is disseminated broadly to internal and external stakeholders, partners, donors and other interested parties. Special efforts should be made to distribute or make the evaluation findings accessible to vulnerable and marginalized groups. A workshop with relevant stakeholders will be organized to disseminate and discuss the findings of the evaluation. The report will also be published on the UNCT website and shared with UN DOCO for posting on the UNDG website. | **ETM, WG** | **UNCT** |  |  |
| 2. Extraction and Sharing of Lessons Learned: **WG** will ensure lessons learned from evaluation are extracted and disseminated in order to contribute to strategic planning, learning, advocacy and decision-making at all levels. Lessons should be applied in the design of the following UNDCS cycle and can feed into knowledge management processes internally. | **ETM**  **WG** | UNCT |  |  |
| 1. Development of the Evaluation Management Response: **ESC** issues a management response that outlines agreed upon actions as to how the evaluation findings and recommendations will be addressed by the UNCT. The Evaluation Management Response should be issued within two months after the evaluation findings become available and shared with DOCO and other entities as per the management response guidance (forthcoming). | **ESC** | **UNCT, National counterparts** |  |  |
| 2. Follow up of implementation of management response actions:  This step is beyond the completion of the normal evaluation process and it is normally done as part of annual planning and review processes by the UNCT and other UNDCS stakeholders. It is also a good practice for Audits to examine the extent to which management response actions were flowed up. | **ESC, UNCT** | **National counterparts** |  |  |

***ANNEX 2: DOCUMENTS FOR DESK REVIEW***

Office of the Resident Coordinator:

* UNDCS 2011-2015
* Ninth National Development Plan (NDP) of the Republic of Turkey
* Mid-Term Review Report 2013
* Annual Review Report 2014
* Resident Coordinator Annual Report (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014)

UNDP:

* Country Programme Document
* CPAP?
* Annual Review Reports such as ROAR, IWP, etc.

UNICEF:

* 2011-2015 Country Programme Document
* 2011-2015 Country Programme Action Plan
* 2013 Mid Term Review Report
* 2014 Sitation Analysis (SITAN)
* 2013-2014-2015 Annual Reports
* 2014-2017 UNICEF Strategic Plan
* ‘Justice for Children’ Final Report
* Reports to the EU 2013-2015
* Evaluation of Van Earthquake Psycho-social Programme
* Paper on ‘Child care system in Turkey: trends, issues and future steps’ (part of Multi Country Evaluation)
* Concluding Observations for Turkey on the Convention on the Right of the Child
* [Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children TURKEY COUNTRY STUDY March 2012](http://www.unicef.org.tr/bilgimerkezidetay.aspx?id=134)
* Child Well Being Document
* [Defining and Evaluating Child Well Being Domains and Indicators through The Eyes of Children in Turkey](http://www.unicef.org.tr/bilgimerkezidetay.aspx?id=10164)
* Evaluation of the Syria Crisis Response Programme

UNFPA:

* Country Programme Document
* Country Programme Action Plan
* UN Joint Programme on Women Friendly Cities- Programme Document
* Mid-term Review of Seasonal Agricultural Migrants Project
* Country Office Annual Reports
* Evaluation of UN JP on Women Friendly Cities
* Country Programme Evaluation

WHO:

* Relevant Programmes for 2011-2015
* Programme Review/Progress Reports

FAO:

* FAO Country Programming Document for Turkey 2012-2015
* Annual Reports

ILO:

(will provide docs next week)

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. UNDCS Evaluation Report should be developed in accordance with the UNEG “Standards for Evaluation in the UN system”, “Norms for Evaluation in UN System and “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.” Analysis should include an appropriate discussion of the relative contributions of stakeholders to results. It will consider the evaluation objectives as per *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of results*, as well as the key issues of *design, focus* and *comparative advantage.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)